

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner amend the present application by entering the amendments set forth above in the Listing of Claims. As explained below, the amended claims are believed to be patentable over the art of record.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-3, 5, 21, 23, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,766,076 to Pease et al. ("Pease") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,682,421 to Rowe et al. ("Rowe") and the article "What are relational databases?"

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position that the "gateway processor 138" of Pease includes a programmed hardware configured to provide a "poller function" that is "configured to poll each of the gaming machines . . ." The portions of Pease cited by the Examiner (3:37-4:9 and 6:12-23) do not appear to relate to polling at all, and the portions of Pease that do discuss polling (e.g., 6:48-52) appear to only relate to the use of polling for communications between the central computer system 106 and gateway processor 138.

Applicants also respectfully disagree with the Examiner's apparent position that the reference to player tracking in Pease (*see* Pease at 3:37-4:9) means that the attendant transmissions of data (e.g. "balance" data sent to a gaming machine when a player tracking card is inserted) would take place through the "gateway processor 138" in the manner claimed with respect to the "poller function" and the "data mover function." Pease contains no such disclosure as to the method of transmitting player tracking data.

Applicants have also amended the only pending independent claims (claims 1 and 21) in relation to the "auditable" aspect of the invention. First, Claim 1 is amended to require that the

accounting module be "software." This is supported by Applicants' original specification at least at paragraphs 46 and 63. Second, Claim 1 is amended to require that "the obtained meter data, jackpot data, output ticket data and player data is not in a format useable by the accounting module software." This is supported by Applicants' original specification at least at paragraphs 28, 46 and 63. Third, Claim 1 is amended to require that the poller function of the data processing unit be arranged to format the gaming machine data it obtains "without human intervention" in "a format useable by the accounting module software" before that data is stored in the local tables. This is supported by Applicants' original specification at least at paragraphs 4-5 (contrasting present invention with prior art systems that required "human intervention" to put data "in a format useable by the report generating software"), 9, 46 and 63.

The amendments to Claim 21 and dependent Claim 34 are very similar to the amendments to Claim 1, and are supported by the originally filed specification in the same manner as Claim 1.

The cited references do not, separately or in combination, teach the limitations of the amended independent claims. The Examiner states that the claim limitation requiring formatting "in an auditable format" "does not impose any particular constraint on the formatting, other than the fact that it may be audited." Office Action dated 12/15/2009 at 8. The Examiner also points out that "Pease explicitly teaches that the central system can log winners in an auditable manner," and concludes that the potential winner data in Pease "must be stored in an auditable format, as required by the claimed invention." *Id.* (emph. in original). The present amendments, however, clarify what is meant by putting the data in an "auditable format" in the context of the present invention. Specifically, gaming machine output data that initially is not useable by the accounting module software is put into a format that is useable by the accounting module

software, prior to storing that data in the second relational database. By contrast, Pease merely teaches that data representative of potential winners is stored, in an unspecified format, such that the data is available for auditing that may take place at some future time in some unspecified way (potentially, for example, after a series of manual steps). Pease does not teach that any gaming machine data is locally (i.e., in a data processing unit spaced apart from the database of the central authority), and without human intervention, put into a format that can be used by report-generating software. Applicants also respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement that "the teaching of Pease that data is stored in an auditable manner indicates that no additional steps are required to perform the audit[.]" Office Action dated 12/15/2009 at 9. As described in Applicants' original specification at paragraph 4, it was a disadvantage of prior art systems that "formatting of the data in a format useable by the report generating software has necessitated more than two dozen steps requiring human intervention." There is no disclosure in Pease suggesting that this problem is addressed, and that no manual steps are required in order to take the stored data relating to potential winners and generate an audit report.

The other art of record does not correct for the deficiencies in Pease. Accordingly, the asserted prior art does not render independent claims 1 or 21 obvious. Claims 2-3, 5, 23 and 34 depend from claim 1 or 21, and are thus allowable over the prior art of record at least for the same reasons that claims 1 or 21 are allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims, i.e. claims 1-3, 5, 21, 23 and 34. A Notice of Allowance is solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions or if Applicants can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact Applicants at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,  
**McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.**

Date: June 15, 2010

/ Andrew W. Bateman /  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew W. Bateman  
Reg. No. 64,050

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison Street, 34<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
(312) 775-8000 (telephone)  
(312) 775-8100 (Facsimile)